

## **REMARKS**

Claims 14-21 have been canceled, being directed to non-elected inventions.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested for Claims 1-13, said claims having been variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102, based upon U.S. Patent No. 6,109,582 to Repaci, et al., and under 35 U.S.C. 103, based upon the same Repaci, et al. reference. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Repaci, et al., reference is totally silent as to the adhesive elements being laminated to the clear plastic strip. Not only does the Repaci, et al., reference fail to teach laminating the adhesive strips to the plastic strip, it totally fails to teach how the adhesive is attached to the strip through any mechanism. Col. 5, lines 17 and 18 of Repaci, et al., recite that, "Each of the adhesive areas 20-25 has an adhesive on it for adhesively coupling an object to it." It has no disclosure of any kind telling one how to attach the adhesive areas 20-25 to the strip, much less disclosing, teaching or even suggesting that the adhesive areas could be laminated to the strip, or how to accomplish such lamination.

The normal and accepted manner of accomplishing lamination involves an application of pressure, with or without heat.

Although lamination using pressure can be accomplished in varying forms, the lamination in the presently described process first deposits an adhesive material onto a strip of liner paper and then the adhesive material on the liner paper is pushed against the strip of clear plastic. This three (3) tiered combination is then run through a pair of rollers, and pressure applied to create the lamination. The liner paper is then peeled off to leave the final, laminated product having only the plastic strip and the adhesive "dots" laminated thereon.

Again, the reference has no suggestion of how to secure the adhesive to the underlying

plastic strip — not one single word. On information and belief, the Repaci, et al., reference has never resulted in a single product being manufactured in accord with its disclosures because the inventors, not only did not disclose how to attach the adhesive to the strip, much less how to laminate the adhesive to the strip, but did not, and do not now have knowledge of how to attach the adhesive to the strip.

Moreover, the Examiner has apparently overlooked one very important aspect of the present invention. As called for in Claim 3, the plastic strip has a coated side and an uncoated side. Because the coated side will not stick to the adhesive, the material can be rolled up and shipped in a large roll, not requiring the overlying strip used in FIG. 7 of the Repaci, et al., reference. The use of such a coated side on the strip clearly would not have been obvious to Repaci, et al., because if it were, it would not have included their overlying strip in the finished product.

Moreover, Claim 1 has been amended to call for the adhesive elements to have a lesser width than the width of the plastic strip. This prevents the adhesive from extending to the edges of the plastic strip.

In sharp contrast, the adhesive strips illustrated in the Repaci, et al. reference extend all the way to the two edges of the plastic strip.

The present invention contemplates shipping a plurality of rolls of the plastic strips/adhesive elements, but if, in the shipping process, one attempts to place one roll on top of another with the adhesive extending to the edges, the adhesive edges will stick together. Having the adhesive away from the edges, as called for in Claim 1, prevents this problem from occurring.

The examiner has also alleged that “merely changing the shape of the adhesive elements” is not considered inventive, thus being a basis for a rejection of Claim 5 (circular), Claim 6 (rectangular), Claim 7 (square), Claim 8 (triangular), Claim 9 (pentagonal), Claim 10 (oval), and


Claim 11 (star). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Changing the shape of the adhesive directly effects the amount of adhesion. For example, if a triangle is used, and depending on whether the apex is pointed up or down, the adhesion will vary, thus varying the force required to remove a package, such as a bag of potato chips. This is true for each of the claimed adhesive configurations.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102, based upon the Repaci, et al. reference, be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 7-11 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103, in view of the same Repaci, et al. reference. However, in view of the above comments with respect to the Repaci, et al., reference, and since Claim 1 is the only independent claim, the rejection of Claims 5, 7-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103 should also be withdrawn.

Based upon the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-13 are in *prima facie* condition for allowance and such action is courteously solicited by the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



William E. Johnson, Jr.  
THE MATTHEWS FIRM (Customer #021897)  
Reg. No. 22,719  
2000 Bering Drive, Suite 700  
Houston, Texas 77057  
(713) 355-4200 Telephone  
(713) 355-9689 Facsimile

Aug. 8, 2005

Date